REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendment and following remarks. The applicant has incorporated claim 2 into claim 1. Since claim 2 was already searched and examined, the applicant does not believe that this amendment requires further search or consideration.

Claims 1-5, 7, 0-12 and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robeson U.S. Patent No. 4,259,458 ("Robeson") note columns 1-5, Tables and also claims 16, 17, 32, 35 of the reference; Ogawa et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,417,018 ("Ogawa") see columns 1-6, Table 5, Example 1 and claims 1-3 and 10. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Robeson does not disclose a combination of a), b) and c). In addition, Robeson neither discloses to use reinforcing fibres in an amount of 10 to 80% nor discloses the very small amount of the added "catalyst" c).

It is acknowledged that Robeson discloses many optional ingredients which include fibers. However, Robeson lists fibers in a laundry list of ingredients.

> Robeson discloses at col. 19, starting at line 66
>
> It should, of course, be obvious to those skilled in the art that other additives may be included in the present compositions. These additives include
> 1. plasticizers;
> 2. pigments;
> 3. flame retardant additives, particularly,
> 4. decabromodiphenyl ether and
> 5. triarylphosphates, such as
> 6. triphenylphosphate;
> 7. reinforcing agents, such as
> 8. glass fibers;
> 9. thermal stabilizers;

> 10. ultraviolet light stabilizers processing aids,
> 11. impact modifiers
> 12. and the like.[I] The impact modifiers which can be used are described in U.S. Patent application Ser. No. 049,131 of L. M. Robeson, titled "Impact Modified Polyarylate Blends", filed June 18, 1979. These impact modifiers are a graft copolymer of a vinyl aromatic, an acrylate, an unsaturated nitrile, or mixtures thereof, grafted onto an unsaturated elastomeric backbone and having a tensile modulus (as measured by ASTM D-638, except that the test piece is compression molded to a 20 mil thickness) of less than about 100,000 psi, and preferably from about 15,000 to less than about 100,000 psi.

The only other place that the word fiber appears in the Robeson patent is in example 23 which states,

> The data in Table 10 shows that the addition of polyarylate/poly(ethylene terephthalate) blends to thermoplastic polyurethanes yields higher modulus products while retaining good strength and ultimate elongation. **This method of polymeric reinforcement offers distinct advantages over inorganic filler or fiber reinforcement**. (emphasis added)

Robeson teaches away from using fiber reinforcement, let alone using reinforcing fibres in an amount of 10 to 80%. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Robeson and in fact, Robeson therefore teaches away from the claimed invention.

A disadvantage with the use of sizes or coupling agents in the preparation filled and/or reinforced and/or impact-modified molding compositions is often that the bonding of polymer matrix to the relevant additives (e.g. reinforcing fibres) is still inadequate (see paragraph no. 6 of the published application (2005/0119396)).

The object of the present invention consisted in the provision of filled and/or impact-modified molding compositions composed of thermoplastics which have improved coupling of

the additive phase to the polymer matrix. This improved coupling is apparent in increased surface adhesion and in improved mechanical properties of the molding, and/or in improved dispersion of the additive within the polymer matrix (see paragraph no. 7 of the published application (2005/0119396)).

The object is achieved by the molding composition described in amended claim 1. The use of very small and defined amount of catalyst enables the preparation of the molding compositions having the above described properties, in particular an improved coupling of the additive phase to the polymer matrix.

Robeson neither discloses nor suggests the use of the claimed amounts of catalyst in a molding composition comprising of a), b) and c). Ogawa does not disclose the molding composition according to amended claim 1, in particular, Ogawa does not disclose feature c) of the claimed invention.

Furthermore - if antimony trioxide is considered as a catalyst according to claim 1 c) - Ogawa discloses that antimony trioxide is coated with a film of polysiloxane due to special chemical reactions during a treatment step whereas the catalytic function of the antimony trioxide in respect to an ester interchange reaction or hydrolysis reaction is inactivated.

Ogawa neither discloses nor suggests the molding compositions according to amended claim 1.

For the above reasons, this rejection should be withdrawn. In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

---

[1] The numbers were inserted by the undersigned and were not in the original quote.

Application No. 10/506541
After Final Office Action of March 6, 2006

Docket No.: 05587-00369-US

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 05587-00369-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,

By Ashley I. Pezzner

Ashley I. Pezzner
Registration No.: 35,646
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street
P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(302) 658-9141
(302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant